



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of" Bills of Peace are maintainable to prevent a multiplicity of suits. POMEROY, Eq. JUR. (3rd Ed.), Vol. I, § 269. *Woodruff v. Mining Co.* (1883), 8 Saw. 628; *Siever v. Union Pacific R. R.* (1903), 68 Neb. 91, 93 N.W. Rep. 943. The weight of authority seems to be, though many courts hold otherwise, that so long as the defendants have some community of interest in the issue and in the remedy, the bill may be maintained. POMEROY, Eq. JUR. (3rd Ed.), Vol. I, p. 446. *Bailey v. Tillinghart* (1900), 40 C. C. A. 93 (100). It would seem, therefore, that the decision of the principal case is well warranted by the modern policy of the courts.

EXECUTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS—ALLOWANCE TO SURVIVING CHILDREN—STEPCHILDREN.—The statute of Kentucky exempting certain articles from distribution is as follows: "And if the specified property is not on hand, other property or money in lieu thereof not exceeding fifty (50) dollars, shall be given for the support of the widow and each infant child living with her." *Held*, this did not include nor apply to stepchildren living with her. *Howland's Adm'r. v. Harr et al.* (1906), — Ky. —, 97 S. W. Rep. 358.

As was said in the case of *Sanderlin v. Sanderlin*, 31 Tenn. (1 Swan) 441, the purpose of these statutes is conceived in a spirit of just regard to the affliction, the helplessness and necessities of the widow immediately after the death of the husband and they should receive a liberal construction. Another reason for a more liberal construction is advanced in 2 KENT COM. 192, that if the husband take the wife's child into his own house, he is then considered as standing in loco parentis and is responsible for the maintenance and education of the child so long as it lives with him.

GARNISHMENT—PROCEEDS FROM SALE OF HOMESTEAD EXEMPT.—Plaintiff sued the defendant and summoned Benesh as garnishee. Benesh owed the defendant a portion of the purchase price of the homestead of the defendant, and this was the debt sought to be garnished. Defendant claimed that he intended to reinvest the money in another homestead and although the sale was voluntary the proceeds were still within the homestead exemption law. *Held*, that under the code allowing a homestead to be conveyed free from liens but not specially exempting the proceeds of sale, the proceeds of a voluntary sale of a homestead are exempt from garnishment, if intended to be reinvested in another homestead within a reasonable time. *Becher v. Shaw et ux. (Benesh, Garnishee)* (1906), — Wash. —, 87 Pac. Rep. 71.

This case decides for the first time in the State of Washington the point involved. The decision is based upon a liberal view of the statute of homestead exemption, holding that to allow garnishment of the proceeds of sale would in effect prohibit an exchange of homesteads as allowed by the statute. It follows directly the case of *Watkins v. Blatschinski*, 40 Wis. 347. See also *Cullen v. Harris*, 111 Mich. 20, 69 N. W. 78, 66 Am. St. Rep. 380; *State v. Geddis*, 44 Iowa, 537; *Schuttloffel v. Collins*, 98 Iowa 576, 67 N. W. 397, 60 Am. St. Rep. 216; *Skinner v. Chadwell*, 1 (Ky.) S. W. 437. There is another line of cases which holds that a voluntary sale of a homestead destroys the exemption and renders the proceeds liable to garnishment and attachment. These cases are based upon a strict construction of the statute,